

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Claims 1 and 13 have been amended. Claims 23-26 and 29-30 have been canceled. Claims 1, 3-13 and 15-22 remain pending. Applicant requests the attorney docket number associated with the present application be changed from MICR0424 to MFCP.132805.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 23-26 and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scherr et al., Pub. No. US 2004/0010513 A1, hereinafter Scherr. Claims 23-26 and 29-30 have been canceled, so this rejection is now moot.

Claims 1, 3-13 and 15-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scherr and Zawadski et al., Patent No. 7,107,268, hereinafter Zawadzki. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1, 3-13 and 15-22 under § 103(a).

Independent claim 1 is directed to a method for enabling a user to organize a project and recites: “(i) displaying a plurality of categories of entities from which the user can select ... (ii) in response to the user selecting one of the categories, displaying alternative choices of entities from which the user can select for association with a to do item in the list; and (iii) in response to one of the plurality of alternative choices being selected, providing an indication that said one of the plurality of alternative choices is associated with the to do item in the list.”

The Office admits that Scherr “doesn’t specifically teach displaying a plurality of categories of entities for association with items in the list.” *See* Final Office Action at p. 7. As noted at page 3 of Applicant’s specification, enabling “a user to associate an entity such as a task or template, a document, or a Web link with a selected item in the list of to do items” is one of

the “more powerful functions of the present invention,” especially since “the user can readily access the entity from within the integral user environment” once the entity “has thus been associated with the item.”

The Office asserts that the disclosure missing from Scherr can be found in Zawadzki. The previous Office Action cited column 34, lines 1-47 and Figure 17 of Zawadzki for overcoming the deficiency of Scherr. *See* December 19, 2006 Office Action at p. 10. However, as explained in Applicant’s March 14, 2007 Amendment, the cited portion of Zawadzki fails to teach “displaying a plurality of categories of entities ... for association with a to do item in the list” as required by claim 1. Rather, column 34 of Zawadzki merely describes how to navigate a project tree structure that may include to do items and how to add items to the project tree structure. In Zawadzki, the “items” in the project tree structure are “associated with that Project,” but that does not meet the claim limitation, which requires displaying a plurality of categories of such items *for association with a to do item*.

In addition to column 34 and Figure 17, the Final Office Action cites column 27, line 53 through column 28, line 36 and Figure 16 of Zawadzki for overcoming the deficiency of Scherr. *See* Final Office Action at p. 7. However, Figure 16 and columns 27-28 of Zawadzki also fail to overcome the acknowledged deficiency of Scherr. According to Zawadzki, “FIG. 16 is an example of a home page 1601,” and the “main purpose of this screen 1601 is to provide an overview of the particular user’s activity in the system.” Column 27, lines 27-36. Moreover, “[a]dvanced users typically begin to create, or add items to their own Project folders.” Column 27, lines 57-58. As with column 34 of Zawadzki, the newly-cited passage fails to teach or suggest the claim limitation, which requires displaying a plurality of categories of such items *for*

association with a to do item. Rather, columns 27-28 merely disclose adding items to a home page and associating items with a project (as opposed to associating items with a to do item).

Thus, independent claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Scherr and Zawadzki for at least the reason that the references fail to teach or suggest “displaying a plurality of categories of entities from which the user can select ... displaying alternative choices of entities from which the user can select for association with a to do item in the list; and ... providing an indication that said one of the plurality of alternative choices is associated with the to do item in the list” as set forth in claim 1.

Independent claim 13 is directed to a system for enabling organizing a project and recites: “(v) presenting a plurality of categories of entities on the display ... (vi) in response to a user selecting one of the categories, displaying alternative choices of entities on the display from which a user can select for association with a to do item in the list; and (vii) in response to one of the plurality of alternative choices being selected, providing an indication that said one of the plurality of alternative choices is associated with the to do item in the list.”

The Office admits that Scherr “doesn’t specifically teach displaying a plurality of categories of entities for association with items in the list.” *See* Final Office Action at p. 11. As noted at page 3 of Applicant’s specification, enabling “a user to associate an entity such as a task or template, a document, or a Web link with a selected item in the list of to do items” is one of the “more powerful functions of the present invention,” especially since “the user can readily access the entity from within the integral user environment” once the entity “has thus been associated with the item.”

As with claim 1, the Office asserts with respect to claim 13 that the disclosure missing from Scherr can be found in Zawadzki. The previous Office Action cited column 34,

lines 1-47 and Figure 17 of Zawadzki for overcoming the deficiency of Scherr. *See* December 19, 2006 Office Action at p. 10. However, as explained in Applicant's March 14, 2007 Amendment, the cited portion of Zawadzki fails to teach "displaying a plurality of categories of entities . . . for association with a to do item in the list" as required by claim 13. Rather, column 34 of Zawadzki merely describes how to navigate a project tree structure that may include to do items and how to add items to the project tree structure. In Zawadzki, the "items" in the project tree structure are "associated with that Project," but that does not meet the claim limitation, which requires displaying a plurality of categories of such items *for association with a to do item*.

In addition to column 34 and Figure 17, the Final Office Action cites column 27, line 53 through column 28, line 36 and Figure 16 of Zawadzki for overcoming the deficiency of Scherr. *See* Final Office Action at p. 11. However, Figure 16 and columns 27-28 of Zawadzki also fail to overcome the acknowledged deficiency of Scherr. According to Zawadzki, "FIG. 16 is an example of a home page 1601," and the "main purpose of this screen 1601 is to provide an overview of the particular user's activity in the system." Column 27, lines 27-36. Moreover, "[a]dvanced users typically begin to create, or add items to their own Project folders." Column 27, lines 57-58. As with column 34 of Zawadzki, the newly-cited passage fails to teach or suggest the claim limitation, which requires displaying a plurality of categories of such items *for association with a to do item*. Rather, columns 27-28 merely disclose adding items to a home page and associating items with a project (as opposed to associating items with a to do item).

Thus, independent claim 13 is patentable over the combination of Scherr and Zawadzki for at least the reason that the references fail to teach or suggest "presenting a plurality of categories of entities on the display ... displaying alternative choices of entities on the display

from which a user can select for association with a to do item in the list; and ... providing an indication that said one of the plurality of alternative choices is associated with the to do item in the list” as set forth in claim 13.

Furthermore, dependent claims 3-12 and 15-22 are patentable over the prior art of record. Claims 3-12 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are patentable over the prior art of record for at least the same reasons set forth above for claim 1. Claims 15-22 depend directly or indirectly from claim 13 and are patentable over the prior art of record for at least the same reasons set forth above for claim 13.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, claims 1, 3-13 and 15-22 are now in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of claims 1, 3-13 and 15-22. If any issues remain that would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned by telephone prior to issuing a subsequent action. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional amount required (or to credit any overpayment) to Deposit Account No. 19-2112.

Respectfully submitted,

/Patrick A. Lujin/

Patrick A. Lujin
Reg. No. 35,260

PAL/ms
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Blvd.
Kansas City, MO 64108-2613
816-474-6550